DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 048 JC 860 190

TITLE The Challenge of Change: A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges.
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 36p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Accountability; Administrators; *College Administration; College Faculty; College Programs; College Role; *Community Colleges; Costs; Educational Change; *Educational Finance; Educational Quality; Financial Support; *Governance; Master Plans; Outcomes of Education; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

Pursuant to legislative mandate, this report presents the results of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education's reassessment of California Community Colleges (CCCs). Section 1 provides introductory material highlighting the CCC changes which the Commission believes to be necessary to achieve the goals of universal access, individual success, and educational quality and accountability. The next five sections offer discussions and recommendations concerning: (1) access and success; (2) mission and functions, including transfer education, vocational education, remediation, adult education, community service, and institutional research and evaluation; (3) faculty and administrators, including credentials, recruitment, affirmative action, part-time faculty, tenure, compensation, collective bargaining, and professional development; (4) governance, including the Board of Governors, district organization and management, district governing boards, and campus administration; and (5) finance, including sources of support, budgeting and distributing state support, emergency support, and capital outlay funding. Section 7 discusses the CCC study and recomendations within the context of the Commission's broader purpose. Appendices present preliminary cost estimates for the recommendations adopted by the Commission, a discussion of the establishment and functions of the Commission, and the text of the Senate Bill authorizing the reassessment study. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED269048

THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE

A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges

JC 860 190

COMMISSION FOR THE REVIEW OF THE
MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

1215 FIFTEENTH STREET • SECOND FLOOR • SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

MARCH 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. R. Kerschner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, Governor

COMMISSION FOR THE REVIEW OF THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
1215 FIFTEENTH STREET, SECOND FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
(916) 445-0132

J. Gary Shansby
Chairman

William D. Campbell
Vice Chairman

Commissioners

Seth P. Brunner
Henry Der
Patsy Estrellas
Claudia Hampton, Ed.D.
Bill Honig
Meredith J. Khachigian
George David Kieffer, Esq.
Felix S. LeMarinel
Peter A. McCuen, Ph.D.
Edward R. Mosley, M.D.
Michael R. Peevey
Ray Remy
Harold M. Williams

Executive Director
Lee R. Kerschner, Ph.D.

March, 1986

Members, Joint Legislative Committee for the Review
of the Master Plan for Higher Education

The Commission has completed a reassessment of the California Community Colleges and is transmitting its report to the Joint Legislative Committee, pursuant to Senate Bill 2064 (Stiern), Chapter 1506, Statutes of 1984. The recommendations are numbered for ease of discussion and do not imply priority. The background papers used by the Commission in developing its recommendations will be available shortly.

The Commission believes the Community Colleges are an integral part of the California postsecondary education system and cannot be considered in isolation. Changes in their mission and functions, accessibility, and (to a lesser extent) finance and governance will affect all segments. Accordingly, the Commission has elected to continue its studies on several intersegmental matters as part of its review of the entire Master Plan. However, implementation of its recommendations should not be postponed. The Commission believes it extremely important to begin the process of change at the earliest opportunity, thereby enabling both the Community Colleges and the State to meet the needs of all Californians in the most efficient and effective manner possible.

The Commission is grateful to all who provided information, analysis, and testimony that permitted Commissioners to develop this report and its recommendations. The Commission is particularly appreciative of the excellent studies provided by the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, the University of California, the California State University, the State Board of Education, the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, and individual Community Colleges and organizations.

The Commissioners worked diligently to absorb and synthesize large amounts of material and were assisted by a talented and hard working staff that provided information and analyses on very short time lines. The report "The Challenge of Change: A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges," is the work of the Commissioners. We are available to discuss it with you.

Sincerely yours,

J. Gary Shansby
Chairman

Enclosure

Contents

One	INTRODUCTION	1
Two	ACCESS AND SUCCESS IN THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES	5
Three	MISSION AND FUNCTIONS	7
	Mission	7
	Transfer Education	8
	Vocational Education	9
	Remediation	10
	State-Funded, Noncredit Adult Education	11
	Fee-Based Community Service	12
	Institutional Research and Evaluation	12
Four	FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS	13
	Credentials	13
	Recruitment and Affirmative Action	13
	Employment of Part-Time Faculty	14
	Tenure	14
	Compensation	15
	Collective Bargaining	15
	Professional Development	16
Five	GOVERNANCE	17
	Board of Governors	17
	District Organization and Management	18
	District Governing Boards	19
	Campus Administration	20
Six	COMMUNITY COLLEGE FINANCE	21
	Sources of Support	21
	Budgeting State Support	21
	Distributing State Support	22
	Emergency Support	23
	Capital Outlay Funding	23
Seven	A NEW MASTER PLAN FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA	25
Appendices		
	A. Preliminary Cost Estimates	27
	B. The Commission and the Process	29
	C SB 2064 (Stiern), Chapter 1506	33

One Introduction

This report is about change, the change the Commission believes necessary in the California Community Colleges to achieve the goals of universal access, individual success, and education which is both high quality and accountable to the people of California.

Access alone does open the door to higher education, but without success it is a door which too often leads to broken dreams and shattered promises. Too frequently it is forgotten that access without success does not equal opportunity.

Much has been done, and we are close to the realization of these goals -- thanks to forward thinking State and Community College policymakers over the years. But some further admittedly difficult steps must be taken, and the time for action is now.

Since the early 1900s, the California Community Colleges have been a gateway to opportunity for millions of Californians. In their earliest years, they were only a few campuses, open to all, serving the particular needs of their own communities. The end of World War II saw phenomenal growth in enrollments, as veterans undertook postsecondary study, and the launching of Sputnik in 1957 sparked a new focus on higher education. The numbers tell the story: by 1960, when the first Master Plan for Higher Education was written, there were 66 Community College campuses with a total enrollment of over 340,000. Today, 106 campuses enroll over a million students.

The 1960 Master Plan sought to bring order and reason to the rapid growth that characterized not only the Community Colleges but also the State Colleges, the University of California, and the independent colleges and universities. The primary functions assigned the Community Colleges were: to provide instruction in the first two years toward an undergraduate degree, with the expectation that students in this course of study would transfer to a four-year college or university; and to provide vocational and technical training leading to employment for students who did not pursue college degrees. Underlying this role was the expectation that the Community Colleges would remain accessible to all.

Since 1960, rapid demographic and societal changes have brought new meaning to the Community Colleges' commitment to access. California's population steadily grows older and ethnically more diverse, and society grows more aware of and sympathetic to changes in the workforce and lifestyle of the populace. Again, the numbers tell the story: by the turn of this century, Hispanics will comprise nearly thirty percent of the State's population. Asians and blacks will comprise sixteen percent. In other words, the ethnic "minority" population will increase from one-third in 1980 to nearly one-half in the year 2000.

Responding to the demographic and societal changes that occurred in the late 1960s and into the 1970s, the Community Colleges began to diversify. Today, they offer language and citizenship training for immigrants, basic education skills for undereducated adults, and cultural enrichment for their communities, in addition to offering courses within their original transfer and vocational education functions. More Californians from a wider variety of backgrounds than ever now attend the Community Colleges.

But it is not enough just to provide a campus, a classroom, and an instructor to those who seek postsecondary education. Though that is an essential first step, its meaningfulness is diminished if what is provided is not of the highest quality. There must be a commitment on all sides -- from the State, from the colleges, and from the students -- to excellence and accountability. It is to this end that we urge change.

Access and Success

Asked to provide low-cost access to those who might never have considered higher education as an option, the Community Colleges have succeeded beyond all expectation. But with the tremendous growth in the numbers of students, types of programs, and costs of the system -- and faced with greater competition for fewer dollars following the 1978 passage of Proposition 13 -- many members of the public and the Legislature began to question the manner in which the commitment to access has been manifest. Now, some wonder if it is really cost effective, educationally sound, or good public policy to provide increasingly varied State-funded programs as a means of attracting students and whether the process of attracting students is equivalent to meaningful open access.

The Commission considered these questions in the context of a full range of options for Community College admissions, from open to selective. In the final analysis, we support the historic commitment to open access. But access must be meaningful; and to be meaningful, it must be access to a quality system that helps ensure the success of every student who enrolls. The responsibility for this success falls on all who participate -- particularly those who teach and those who learn.

The colleges have a responsibility to provide meaningful guidance and an appropriate framework within which students can develop their educational goals, pursue appropriate courses, and obtain the support services necessary for success. Given this framework, students have the responsibility to be serious about their studies and to be the primary motivators in their own success. Linking these two responsibilities -- institutional direction and student motivation -- is the key to linking access and success. Much can be done to forge this link.

In the section titled "Access and Success," we recommend change.

Mission and Functions

Access and success mean little outside the context of the Community College mission and functions. Attempting to be all things to all people is a task too large for success, yet it is the task the Community Colleges find themselves facing in their efforts to maintain open access. Although the need for remedial education, adult basic skills education, and literacy training for both native and foreign born will continue to increase for the foreseeable future, these functions should supplement and not supplant the transfer and vocational education functions of the Community Colleges. The focus established in the 1960 Master Plan is appropriate and more should be done to reassert it: the Community Colleges are postsecondary in nature, and their primary mission should be to provide accessible academic and vocational education toward associate degrees, transfer, or employment.

In the section titled "Mission and Functions," we recommend change.

Faculty and Administrators

In recommending a reaffirmation of transfer and vocational education as the primary functions of the Community Colleges, we stress that the colleges must respond to the increasing diversity of their student pool by fostering institutional flexibility and innovation. Quality faculty, administrators, and staff are essential to providing the positive learning environment and quality instruction that will encourage individuals from every background to attend the colleges and to succeed. Community College personnel policies should reflect the postsecondary nature of the institutions and encourage institutional flexibility, excellence in teaching, and efficient management. The colleges should be free of rigid personnel requirements and operating procedures that are costly to administer and unresponsive to changing needs. Additionally, they should recruit faculty, administrators, and staff that meet the highest standards and reflect the diversity of the colleges' communities. Much can be done toward these goals.

In the section titled "Faculty and Administrators," we recommend change.

Governance

Governance of the colleges is a key to their success. An appropriate governance structure should reflect and support the postsecondary nature of the colleges, be accountable to taxpayers, and provide statewide leadership, while encouraging and supporting local leadership and initiative. The current Community College governance structure falls short of these marks because the State Board of Governors has insufficient authority to lead the colleges toward the realization of these goals, and because the once virtually autonomous local governing boards lost most of their power with the passage of Proposition 13. Much can be done to fill this leadership vacuum.

In the section titled "Governance," we recommend change.

Finance

The Community Colleges today labor under a system of finance incongruous to postsecondary education. The current method of finance reflects the colleges' origins as an outgrowth of the public schools and is based on a workload measure that cannot adequately respond to changing circumstances. A new and more predictable, flexible, and accountable finance system is needed to allow the colleges to function as postsecondary institutions. Much can be done to realize these goals.

In the section titled "Finance," we recommend change.

Summary

The greatest strengths of the California Community Colleges are their diversity and accessibility and their ability to meet local community needs, while at the same time serving as the State's largest provider of postsecondary education. More diverse than any other public postsecondary segment, the Community Colleges face the challenge of molding many disparate elements into a harmonious -- not homogenized -- system that can meet the needs of Californians with increasing success toward the year 2000. Much can be done to meet this challenge. To that end, we submit this report.

Two Access and Success in the California Community Colleges

Because Community Colleges are close to home, inexpensive, and unrestrictive in admissions, they are in a literal sense accessible. In recent years, access has taken on additional meaning. The Civil Rights movement of the 1960s, combined with California's changing demography and growing demand for a more highly skilled workforce, made access an issue of equal opportunity for disadvantaged groups and women. In the last twenty years, the Community Colleges' commitment to access has been manifest in the creation of a wide variety of educational programs to attract and serve students from extremely diverse backgrounds. Today, the Community Colleges are the principal point of entry to postsecondary education for the greatest number and variety of Californians seeking instruction in the liberal arts and sciences, technology, vocational skills, English as a Second Language, and basic skills remediation. Eighty percent of all underrepresented students who enter postsecondary education do so through the Community Colleges.

But even as new programs were designed and added to attract students who might not otherwise have sought postsecondary education, a new challenge emerged. Unprepared for the academic demands of the college curriculum, many students struggled to stay in school, and not a few failed. The traditional open door that was the key to the Community Colleges' commitment to access became, for some, a revolving door.

The lesson to be learned is that access is only half the task; the other half is to improve the probability of success for every student by making learning more meaningful and demanding, and by better defining and communicating the expected outcomes of a Community College education.

Success requires a cooperative effort that must be undertaken with equal vigor by institution and student alike. The colleges can improve their ability to address the wide variety of academic backgrounds, expectations, and abilities of their diverse student populations by gathering better information, putting the information to better use, and communicating with students. Such a program would be a valuable tool to the colleges in assessing whether students and institutions are achieving their educational objectives.

Students share responsibility for their educational success. It is reasonable to expect hard work, dedication, and persistence from students.

The Commission believes that assessment, counseling, and placement is a critical first step in student retention. Assessment is more than a mere test; it involves counseling and evaluation of individual learners, including their educational preparation, motivation and aspirations. While students holding a baccalaureate or higher degree may be exempted, this program will enable the college to provide the instruction, the appropriate options, and other assistance necessary for students to achieve their educational objectives.

California's demographic future will demand that the Community Colleges continue to prepare large numbers of a diverse population for meaningful participation in society. By the year 2000, ethnic minorities will account for more than forty-five percent of the State's total population. Additionally, the number of adult learners will increase and the numbers of women seeking new opportunity in the employment market will continue to grow. These factors will significantly increase the need to provide relevant and up-to-date occupational training programs, instruction in English as a Second Language, remediation, and preparation for transfer to four-year institutions.

Ethnic minorities, adult learners, and women have been traditionally underserved in many postsecondary education programs, and it will be costly to strengthen programs to the degree nec-

essary to serve them well in the future. Failure to do so will cost far more! A major commitment of financial and human resources is necessary.

The Commission recommends:

1. That the Governor and the Legislature join in a reaffirmation of open access to the California Community Colleges as a cornerstone in the State's efforts to provide equal opportunity to all high school graduates and others at least eighteen years of age capable of profiting from the instruction offered.

At the same time, the Community Colleges must take specific steps to improve academic quality and student success.

The Commission recommends:

2. That the Board of Governors combine open access with clearly defined academic standards. In consultation with the colleges and the Academic Senate, the Board shall cause to be established minimum academic skill levels appropriate for the different types of courses and programs offered, as well as strengthen current probation and dismissal standards for students. Students needing academic assistance or additional preparation should be provided access, through remedial programs, to enable them to enter college courses in a reasonable period of time.

3. That the Board of Governors require a mandatory assessment, counseling, placement, and follow-up program in the California Community Colleges, and that the Legislature and Governor provide adequate funding for the program. This program must be accompanied by access, if needed, to remedial education as recommended later in this report.

The Commission believes these recommendations, combined with the colleges' laudable performance in providing access to those who historically have been underrepresented in postsecondary education, will help the Community Colleges meet the challenge of providing a meaningful education to all who seek it.

Three Mission and Functions

In the 1960 Master Plan, the primary functions of the Community Colleges were clear: to provide access to higher education for those whose high school academic record, financial circumstances, or family obligations prevented attendance at the University of California, the State Colleges, or the independent institutions; and to provide access to vocational training for those who sought employment without a baccalaureate degree.

In the twenty-five years since the Master Plan, as California's population has grown more diverse, the needs and expectations of the community college student pool have become more varied. This reflects the large numbers of ethnic minorities, reentry women, non-English speaking immigrants, students unprepared for college-level work, handicapped, and working adults who now make up the majority of the enrollments in many Community Colleges. This broadening of student clientele has produced a shift in emphasis -- or at least in enrollments -- away from transfer and toward vocational, remedial, adult basic education, and community service. The combination of these factors threatens to erode the Community Colleges' transfer and vocational education functions.

The Community Colleges play an important role in society by responding to the needs of a changing and increasingly diverse population and should continue to do so. Not wishing to discourage this responsiveness, but convinced that the colleges cannot successfully be all things to all people, we recommend priorities among the functions that will permit the colleges to work successfully toward their mission.

Mission

We believe the colleges' mission is to provide meaningful access to and success in postsecondary education. We do not use the terms "mission" and "functions" interchangeably. Rather, we use "mission" to connote our vision of what the Community Colleges can contribute to the individual and society. "Functions" are the elements that move the colleges toward their mission.

Students and all of society benefit from the education obtained from a transfer program. Individuals gain a broader understanding of themselves, society, and the world; options for employment and higher potential lifetime earnings are increased; social mobility is enhanced. Society benefits from a highly educated and involved population whose income and work improve the economy and whose participation enriches the community.

Vocational education is equally significant as a productive option for those who do not choose the path to a baccalaureate degree or for those seeking job upgrading and retraining opportunities. Individual students gain through increased occupational and financial opportunity in an increasingly complex work world, and society gains through the growth and improvement of the workforce and hence the economy.

Although the demand for adult education, English as a Second Language, literacy training, and remediation shows no signs of slowing -- and can in fact be expected to increase between now and the year 2000 -- we consider transfer and vocational education as primary. Other functions are worthwhile, and we do not recommend their elimination from Community Colleges; rather, we see them as supplementing, not supplanting, transfer and vocational education.

The Commission recommends:

4. That the highest priorities and primary functions of the California Community Colleges be reaffirmed as the provision of rigorous, high quality lower division instruction for students who wish to obtain associate degrees, transfer to a four-year institution, or prepare for an occupation.

5. That remedial education be affirmed as an important function of the colleges. It is essential to helping inadequately prepared students succeed at the postsecondary level.

6. That State-funded, noncredit adult education, of less than collegiate level, be affirmed as an authorized function of the colleges for those adults who cannot or do not wish to enroll in the regular credit programs.

7. That fee-based community service education be affirmed as an authorized function of the colleges for the purpose of providing programs that respond to the interests of the community, so long as such programs are fully fee-supported and do not detract from the colleges' primary functions.

The designation of these functions as primary, important, or authorized is specifically intended to suggest their appropriate priority within the Community College mission.

Transfer Education

A number of factors contribute to the decline in the numbers of students transferring from the Community Colleges to the University of California and the California State University. These include: decreased numbers of high school graduates; increased drop-out rates for ethnic minorities; student underpreparation for college-level work; inadequate student financial aid; and the increasing proportion of UC- and CSU- eligible students entering those segments as freshmen. In addition, many students choose specific occupational training over preparation for a baccalaureate degree because personal circumstances encourage immediate employment over long-term education, and some are discouraged by the predominantly full-time nature of educational offerings at the University of California and the California State University.

Many of these factors are beyond the scope of the Community Colleges alone, and are a responsibility properly shared by all of California's educational institutions, from the public schools through the university level. But as initial steps, the colleges can coordinate efforts to remove other barriers to transfer. Potential transfer students should not be hindered by shifting requirements for transfer, both in general education and within specific majors, among the four-year campuses. Additionally, the associate degree should signify completion of a core curriculum and college-level skill competencies to ensure applicability to transfer.

Although recommendations such as mandatory assessment, counseling, and placement; remedial education; and redirected mission priorities will help improve transfer rates, more work will be needed. In addition, improvement in the transfer rates of ethnic minority students requires sucessful intervention strategies long before the postsecondary education level; indeed it requires a much broader, deeper commitment from the society at large. The Master Plan Review will continue to address these issues. What follows are the initial steps

The Commission recommends:

8. That the Board of Governors, the Regents of the University of California, and the Trustees of the California State University, with appropriate faculty consultation, cooperatively develop and maintain a general education transfer core curriculum which, with the courses required for specific majors, will ensure transfer to the University of California or the California State University systems upon successful completion of the appropriate courses and maintenance of the requisite grade point average.

9. That the Board of Governors communicate the core curriculum to the State Board of Education to be used as part of its curriculum development procedures, so that secondary school students are aware of the requirements for collegiate preparation and transfer and can receive any necessary remediation at the earliest possible opportunity.

10. That the specific requirements for collegiate preparation and transfer be published jointly by the Board of Governors, the Regents of the University of California, and the Trustees of the California State University, and distributed to all junior high schools, high schools, and community col-

leges in California, with particular attention to schools with high minority-student populations.

11. That the Board of Governors redesign both the Associate in Arts (AA) and the Associate in Science (AS) degree requirements to include the transfer core curriculum, courses for specific college majors, and elective requirements. No courses beyond these areas should be required for the AA or AS degrees. Degrees should be awarded upon completion of the core curriculum, major, and elective requirements.

12. That Community College students who were not eligible for University of California or California State University admission directly from high school be required to complete the transfer core curriculum, within the currently required number of units, prior to transfer. Exceptions could be made for those students with only one or two secondary school course or subject deficiencies.

13. That the Board of Governors invite and encourage the independent four-year institutions to participate in the development of the core curriculum and the efforts to improve the transfer function, and to consider their applicability to their own institutions.

Vocational Education

The demand for vocational education in the Community Colleges over the past twenty-five years has increased dramatically, with students interested in entry-level occupational skills, job skills upgrading, and retraining opportunities. Half of the students now cite a vocational goal as their reason for attending a Community College. But there are problems.

First, occupational stereotyping in the workforce is mirrored in many of the colleges' vocational education programs: in fifteen of the thirty largest programs over eighty percent of the students are of the same gender. Additionally, ethnic minorities and women are underrepresented in certain programs, leading to their underrepresentation in many fields of work. This problem merits programs that encourage men and women from all ethnic and economic backgrounds to consider nontraditional vocational education and job training options. Solving this problem in the colleges will be a major step toward solving the same problem in the workforce.

Second, a number of occupations, such as nursing, computer science, and accounting, permit a continuum of preparation from the secondary through the university level. Students need assurance of smooth articulation of course and program requirements from one level of education to the next.

Finally, for those occupations where training is completed in the Community Colleges, employers need assurance that a student is prepared for immediate employment and possesses basic competence in general education. We believe the Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degree provides a valuable option for those interested in a degree that is more intensely focused on occupational skills and articulation with business and industry than are the AA and AS degrees, but is comparable in quality. The National Council for Occupational Education has endorsed acceptance of the AAS degree and makes specific recommendations for its design. A substantial number of students in community colleges nationally receive this degree.

The Commission recommends:

14. That the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education each identify their vocational programs that show evidence of underrepresentation of specific groups and together assist the colleges in developing programs, in cooperation with local secondary schools, to encourage students to enter those vocational programs in which they are underrepresented.

15. That the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education, with appropriate faculty consultation, help local high schools and Community Colleges to establish closely articulated "2+2" programs -- two years in high school, two in a Community College -- where such programs would meet local student and employer needs, and that in

cooperation with the Trustees of the California State University, with appropriate faculty consultation, develop articulated "2+2+2" vocational programs leading to the baccalaureate degree where appropriate.

16. That the Board of Governors and the Trustees of the California State University cooperatively establish vocational education transfer programs, ensuring articulation at both the State and local levels, with faculty from both segments cooperating in curriculum development. Vocational students seeking an AS degree should be required to satisfy the transfer core curriculum and courses specific to occupational major requirements. Local colleges should be authorized to award the AS degree upon completion of the transfer core curriculum, occupational major, and elective requirements.

17. That the Board of Governors authorize the Community Colleges to grant a new Associate of Applied Science degree, to prepare students for immediate employment in fields where there is no baccalaureate degree. The AAS degree should indicate basic competence in general education as well as in entry-level occupational skills.

18. That the Board of Governors invite and encourage the independent institutions to participate in the development of vocational transfer programs and to consider their application to their own institutions.

The diversity of the Community College student clientele requires a recognition that not all colleges need be exactly alike in their programs and services. Some colleges have chosen to focus on the economic needs and occupational and training demands of their own communities, and have developed vocational education and job training programs that are models of the college/business/industry partnership.

Also, some Community Colleges' student clienteles are so vocationally oriented that these colleges have lost the critical mass of transfer students necessary to maintain a viable transfer program, and have had few if any students transfer to the University of California or the California State University for a number of years. There may be no need for these colleges to offer programs for which there is limited clientele.

The Commission recommends:

19. That the Board of Governors develop criteria and procedures whereby Community Colleges can apply to be designated as technical colleges with a focus on quality vocational degree, certificate, and business/industry cooperative programs, so long as students continue to have reasonable geographic access to a comprehensive Community College should they choose that option.

20. That the Board of Governors encourage all Community Colleges, but particularly the designated technical colleges, to work closely with local business and industry to meet the economic development and employment training needs of the community through vocational education, job training, and employer-specific contract education programs.

Remediation

The Commission has affirmed remediation as an important function of the Community Colleges, because it is essential to helping inadequately prepared students succeed in transfer and vocational education and attainment of the associate degree. The availability of remedial courses helps maintain the academic integrity of transfer and vocational courses and makes possible the open access to institutions and the conditional access to courses that is recommended in the "Access and Success" section of this report. Mandatory assessment, counseling, and placement must be combined with an extensive and effective remedial education program.

The Community Colleges are the primary postsecondary providers of remediation, and should remain so; however, they should not bear the entire burden of overcoming substantial educational weaknesses. The public school system must continue to improve student reading, writing, and mathematical skills, and student reten-

tion and high school graduation rates to help alleviate basic skills deficiencies.

The demand for remedial education has increased in all postsecondary segments, but especially in the Community Colleges, because of the decline in high school standards, the increasing dropout rate, the cap on growth of adult education programs in the public schools, and the growing numbers of adults who seek basic skills, language, and literacy training. While higher proportions of ethnic minority students need remedial courses and programs, the need cuts across all ethnic groups and affects students from all socioeconomic backgrounds, high school graduates or not.

The Commission recommends:

21. That the Board of Governors authorize Community Colleges to continue to provide remedial education courses as needed to help students succeed at the postsecondary education level. Such courses should be offered only for noncredit or nondegree credit (i.e., not applicable to the associate degree nor certifiable for transfer).

22. That the Board of Governors establish a limit to the number of units of remedial coursework a student may take. The Commission endorses a limit of thirty semester or forty-five quarter credit units. Students needing additional remedial work should be directed to noncredit adult basic education programs, in either the Community Colleges or the adult schools, or to other community-based services. English as a Second Language and learning-disabled students should be exempt from the unit limit, and college counselors should be permitted to request waivers for students who reach the unit limit but are still showing significant, measurable progress toward acquisition of college-level skills.

23. That the Board of Governors establish a policy that enrollment in remedial courses be mandated based on the student assessment, counseling and placement program recommended in this report's section on "Access and Success."

24. That the Board of Governors establish a policy that concurrent enrollment in nonremedial courses be made contingent on student achievement of appropriate collegiate skill levels.

25. That the Board of Governors establish a policy that competency skill levels and their assessment be closely articulated with Community College feeder high schools.

State-Funded, Noncredit Adult Education

Adult literacy training and basic skills education are expected to join English as a Second Language and remediation as the most difficult challenges facing California education in the next fifteen years. The responsibility for noncredit adult education services should continue to be shared between the public schools and the Community Colleges, but changes are needed to ensure that the needs of local communities are effectively and efficiently met. There is disagreement about which courses should receive State support and which should be fee-based, and there is historical confusion over which courses should be offered by the public schools and which by the Community Colleges. These conflicts are further complicated by the differing amount of money the State pays each segment for providing these courses.

The Commission recommends:

26. That the California Postsecondary Education Commission, in consultation with the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education, conduct a study of the current and projected need for and funding of noncredit adult education, including the ten State-funded areas, in the Community Colleges and public school system adult schools, in light of the State's changing demographics.

27. That the Legislature strengthen the current statutes by mandating local delineation of function agreements. The agreements should be reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education. Sanctions for noncompliance

should be established in order to ensure cooperation between the public schools and the Community Colleges. (Such sanctions could include the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education each selecting one representative, and these two selecting a third person, to draft delineation of function agreements for any districts that are not able to reach agreement. An additional sanction could include the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education jointly agreeing not to release any funds for noncredit adult education to a particular region, pending signing and filing of the delineation of function agreement.)

Fee-Based Community Services

Community service offerings in the colleges encompass avocational, recreational, and professional inservice classes, as well as community development and cultural activities. The Commission supports these offerings as non-State-funded, authorized functions of the colleges.

The Commission recommends:

28. That the Board of Governors collect statewide data on community service programs and institute full, uniform cost-accounting procedures, including direct and indirect costs, to ensure that no State funds are used for their support.

29. That the Legislature, having already established the "no State support/full fee support" policy for community service programs, establish no further rules regarding these programs.

30. That the colleges continue to offer community service classes according to the interests of the community, as long as those classes are fully user fee supported and do not detract from the colleges' primary responsibilities.

Institutional Research and Evaluation

Institutional research is essential to determine which types of programs work best with which students under what circumstances, and to ensure the wisest use of public funds in meeting student and community needs. There is relatively little statewide institutional research available to evaluate the effectiveness of Community College transfer, vocational, or remedial programs, which are of particular concern to this Commission. If these programs are to be implemented successfully and cost-effectively, they must be accompanied by research and evaluation from the start, to strengthen these programs as they develop as well as to evaluate their ultimate merit. Significant additional funds will be needed for this research.

The Commission recommends:

31. That the governing boards of the segments jointly establish research programs to evaluate student preparation, persistence, and performance before and after transfer, and publish the results statewide in a timely fashion.

32. That the Board of Governors establish research and evaluation programs for vocational-student and employer follow-up at both the State and local levels, to determine whether vocational programs are functioning effectively and meeting student and employer needs. The Board of Governors should establish statewide evaluation measures for comparative purposes and assist the colleges in designing appropriate research and follow-up mechanisms. Results should be published statewide in a timely fashion.

33. That the Board of Governors establish a research program to evaluate the effectiveness of the assessment/counseling/placement program at both the State and local levels once it is implemented. The Board of Governors should report to the Legislature on the success of the program on a biennial basis, with the first report due two years after implementation of the program statewide.

Four Faculty and Administrators

To respond successfully to the challenges ahead, the Community Colleges must be concerned not only with access and success and with the strength of their instructional programs, but also with the quality of the faculties and staff who teach and administer those programs. In the past, the colleges have often successfully attracted and retained excellent teachers and administrators, even during periods of rapid growth. Past achievements, however, do not guarantee future success. Accordingly, the Commission has reviewed a number of factors directly related to the quality of Community College faculty and administrators: credentialling, recruitment and affirmative action, employment of part-time faculty, tenure, compensation, collective bargaining, and staff development.

Credentials

The Community Colleges must recruit and retain faculty and administrators with the highest professional qualifications. To this end, the Board of Governors must establish qualifications appropriate to postsecondary institutions and make certain that both full-time and part-time faculty appointments are subject to peer review, as they are in other collegiate institutions.

California is the only state to retain a system of credentialling for community college faculty and administrators originally developed for the elementary and secondary schools. Under this system, new faculty are to obtain a credential in one or more of sixty-six subject matter areas based on a *pro forma* paper review. There is no requirement that proposed new faculty appointments be reviewed by tenured faculty in the appropriate department or division of each college. This system is unnecessarily rigid, cumbersome, and unsuited to the academic rigor of postsecondary institutions.

The Commission recommends:

34. That the Legislature delete from the *Education Code* existing credential requirements for Community College faculty and administrators.

35. That the Legislature authorize the Board of Governors, in consultation with the faculty, to (a) establish qualifications for employment of faculty and administrators, and (b) require that new faculty appointments, both full-time and part-time, be subject to peer review in addition to other administrative procedures.

Recruitment and Affirmative Action

The Community Colleges should recruit faculty and administrators who approximate the mix of ethnic background and gender of the communities they serve and who meet the highest professional standards. The colleges are responsible not only to provide appropriate role models and equal educational opportunity but also to advance the State's public policy goal of equal employment opportunity. The growing diversity of the population demands the same growth in the diversity of college faculty and staff. The Board of Governors has adopted regulations requiring the Community Colleges to develop and implement affirmative-action employment plans. It has also established a system of affirmative-action employment targets for the colleges and continues to monitor progress toward those targets. The most recent data on Community College faculty and staff indicate, however, that the faculty and administrative staff of the colleges remain predominantly white and male, although some progress has been made in the employment of underrepresented minorities and women. To a

large degree, this is an intersegmental and societal problem that must be addressed in the Commission's Master Plan Review, but a much stronger effort by the Community Colleges is needed now.

The Commission recommends:

36. That the Board of Governors prepare a plan for strengthening Community College faculty and staff affirmative action policies and programs and monitor and publish the results by college. The plan should include clear lines of district accountability for its success and ensure participation in and commitment to effective affirmative action by district trustees, administrators, and faculty alike.

Employment of Part-Time Faculty

Each college must employ a strong core of full-time faculty responsible for maintaining the highest professional standards among their colleagues and within the college itself. The personnel policies for the Community Colleges must encourage institutional flexibility and be free of costly and rigid requirements. The employment of part-time faculty may be desirable to meet unanticipated growth, teach evening classes, staff specialized programs, and provide special skills or experience not otherwise available.

At the same time, the colleges should require part-time faculty to be available to students and to participate in curricular development in much the same manner as full-time faculty. This is particularly important if students are to have access to skilled assessment, counseling, and placement services as recommended earlier.

Community College districts vary widely in their employment of part-time faculty as a consequence of their differing program emphasis, enrollment gains and losses, and other factors. Statewide, the percentage of faculty who are employed full-time has risen from thirty-one percent in 1977-78 to forty-two percent in 1983-84. Nevertheless, concern for possible excessive use of part-time instructors resulted in legislation that prohibits districts from employing part-time instructors in greater numbers (as measured by weekly faculty contact hours) than they did on average over the three-year period 1980-81 through 1982-83 without approval by the Board of Governors. The Commission believes that this statutory provision is overly restrictive, and that the matter of part-time faculty, like virtually all other faculty matters, is better left to the Board of Governors and the colleges.

There are four principal kinds of part-time instructors: those who teach one or two classes in fields in which they are employed, those who teach part-time in two or more districts and are therefore actually full-time instructors, those who teach in a public school or another postsecondary institution, and those full-time instructors who teach one or two classes beyond their full-time loads. Instructors in the first three categories are generally unavailable to students outside the classroom and do not participate in curricular development or other faculty activities. Thus, they cannot contribute to the collegial nature of campus administration or to the counseling and other forms of support needed by many students, and their contributions to the quality of instruction is less than it should be.

The Commission recommends:

37. That the Legislature repeal the statutory restriction on the employment of part-time faculty and authorize the Board of Governors to establish a statewide policy for the Community Colleges consistent with the objective of maintaining a core of experienced full-time faculty in each major department.

38. That the Board of Governors urge the Community Colleges to require part-time instructors to participate in student advisement and curricular development in addition to classroom instruction.

39. That the Legislature authorize Community College districts to employ those part-time faculty who teach six units or more on a contractual basis, as recommended in the following section.

Tenure

In virtually every other postsecondary setting, new full-time faculty must serve a reasonable period of probation, during which they can be thoroughly evaluated by their peers as well as by students and administrators. Tenure is granted only after six or seven years of probation and by vote of the tenured members of each candidate's department or division. A formal system of peer review, prior to the granting of tenure, and a system of periodic evaluation of tenured and part-time faculty by their peers, students, and administrators will significantly strengthen the faculties of the Community Colleges. Current evaluation procedures, which are determined by each district board in consultation with its faculty, do not appear to be adequate for this purpose. Full-time Community College faculty currently receive tenure after less than two years of employment and without formal peer review. This tenure system is similar to that of the elementary and secondary schools and does little to help the colleges demand excellence in teaching as a primary goal.

The colleges have no contractual system for employing faculty for more than a year without granting them tenure. This unnecessarily limits the ability of districts to retain highly skilled and experienced part-time instructors. The employment policies for Community College faculty must encourage excellence in teaching, curricular flexibility, and efficient management.

The Commission recommends:

40. That the Legislature authorize the Board of Governors to establish the number of years new full-time faculty shall serve prior to receiving tenure. The Commission supports a probationary period of at least four years.

41. That the Legislature authorize the Board of Governors to establish a formal system of peer review prior to the granting of tenure, and periodic evaluation of part-time, probationary, and tenured faculty by their peers, students, and administrators. Evaluation reports should be reviewed whenever faculty are considered for advancement in rank and salary.

42. That the Legislature authorize the Board of Governors to develop, and one or more districts to adopt, a pilot program of two- to five-year "rolling" contracts, coupled with periodic peer and student review, as an alternative to tenure.

Compensation

Unlike other postsecondary institutions that base compensation on academic rank and achievement, salaries of Community College faculty and administrators are now set by district boards according to schedules based on the extent of the employee's formal education and years of service. The Community Colleges should develop salary schedules based upon academic rank, enabling them to promote faculty according to their contributions to the institution rather than solely on the basis of longevity or course credits. The colleges should also be encouraged to compensate part-time faculty for participating in student advisement, curricular planning, and other activities closely related to the quality of education on each campus. These two changes will encourage the excellence that must characterize a viable postsecondary institution.

The Commission recommends:

43. That the Board of Governors urge the districts to adopt salary schedules for Community College faculty that are based primarily on academic rank.

44. That the Board of Governors urge the districts to compensate part-time faculty appropriately for duties required in addition to classroom teaching.

Collective Bargaining

There must be a clear distinction between matters of policy and administration that are to be determined through collective bargaining with faculty representatives, and those matters more properly decided through consultation among administrators, governing boards, and faculty senates. Among the latter are the criteria

to be used in the appointment, evaluation, and promotion of academic employees.

The Education Employment Relations Act (EERA), which was designed primarily for public school employees, provides little protection for Community College academic senates. Conflicts between the faculty bargaining units and the faculty senates are likely to be resolved in favor of the bargaining units, which may have the same membership as the faculty senates, or to be passed on to the courts. When EERA was enacted, faculty senates were not strong on Community College campuses, hence no special provisions were made for them in the Act. The Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA), which governs collective bargaining for California State University and University of California employees, delineates and protects the role of the academic senates of California State University and University of California with respect to policies affecting academic and professional matters. Comparable protection is logical for Community College academic senates.

The Commission recommends:

45. That the Board of Governors prepare and submit to the Legislature proposed legislation to amend the Education Employment Relations Act to delineate and protect the role of the academic senates with respect to policies affecting academic and professional matters.

Professional Development

Community College instructors, recruited directly from graduate school or from some form of employment other than teaching, may not be prepared to deal effectively with the wide range of student abilities and attitudes found in Community College classrooms. As larger numbers of students from many different cultural backgrounds and with significant language and other deficiencies are enrolled, the problem will become more serious for both administrators and faculty. The establishment of the proposed student assessment, counseling, and placement program on each campus will also require additional training and assistance for both faculty and administrators.

New and experienced faculty, both full-time and part-time, must be encouraged to strengthen their teaching skills through appropriate inservice, on-campus training programs and other activities. Such programs should also provide opportunities for professional growth and the development of interpersonal skills, including those skills important to working with colleagues, participating in peer review, providing student counseling, and other professional activities.

Professional staff development programs are often unsuccessful if they do not provide opportunities for professional growth and are not linked closely to evaluation activities and promotion policies that help to identify the faculty and administrators who can benefit most from inservice training. Professional development programs must be available to college administrators as well as faculty members, and must be closely linked with evaluation and promotion policies.

The Commission recommends:

46. That the Board of Governors develop and implement a plan to strengthen professional development programs on Community College campuses. The programs should serve faculty and administrators alike and be closely linked to regular evaluation and promotion procedures. This plan should be supported by an appropriation to the Board of Governors for allocation among the participating colleges.

Five Governance of the Community Colleges

As the Community Colleges have evolved out of the public school system and into the postsecondary education system, their governance structure retains two basic characteristics of the public school system: largely independent local governing boards and a relatively weak State governing board. Local governing boards have contributed substantially to the responsiveness of the colleges to local needs. In the last decade, however, they have been seriously weakened by their loss of control over district revenues and their difficulties in adjusting to many of the new demands upon them. At the same time, the State governing board that was created to lead the colleges lacks the authority it needs to do so.

In seeking to strengthen the Community College governance structure, the Commission has focused upon the duties and composition of the Board of Governors (which includes the Chancellor's Office), the structure and functions of the districts, the election and training of district board members, and the role of the faculties in campus administration.

Board of Governors

The principal objective of the Community College governance system is to maintain and strengthen the instructional programs of the colleges, while ensuring full accountability to the taxpayers of the State. The governance system must recognize and reinforce the postsecondary character of the colleges and provide a framework for encouraging strong statewide leadership as well as local initiative and responsiveness to the needs of the communities served.

The Board of Governors has been unable to exercise sufficient systemwide leadership to give the Governor and Legislature confidence in the effective and efficient operation of the colleges. The Board's composition, terms of office, and staffing authority are not appropriate to a State postsecondary education governing board. In the absence of a strong board and with the growth of State financing responsibility since the passage of Proposition 13, the Governor and the Legislature have filled the vacuum by becoming directly involved in the governance of the Community Colleges, far more so than in the governance of the four-year institutions.

The Community College system is more complex than the two university systems, and the Commission has found that a strengthened Board is likely to better serve the twin values of statewide leadership and local initiative. The Board can be strengthened by augmenting its leadership authority, enhancing the status of its membership, lengthening members' terms, and giving it greater latitude in the selection of the Chancellor's staff. It will also require significant additional funding to carry out the multiple and new tasks assigned to it in addition to the reallocation of existing resources.

Confidence in the Board's leadership can also be strengthened by establishing a program of annual reports on the educational accomplishments and financial conditions of the colleges, authorizing the Board of Governors to conduct a management audit of any district that may not be performing adequately according to established criteria, and to act directly in the event of continuing inadequate performance by a district.

The Commission recommends:

47. That the Legislature increase the Board of Governors' authority with respect to admission standards, program development, data collection, faculty and staff affirmative action, and budgeting and allocating State support as recommended elsewhere in this report.

48. That the Legislature add to the Board of Governors as ex officio members the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the Assembly, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Chancellor.

49. **That the Legislature increase the (staggered) terms of appointed members from four years to eight years.**

50. **That the California Constitution be amended to remove the Chancellor's Office staff from the State civil service system and a separate merit system for that staff be established.**

51. **That the Legislature authorize the Board of Governors to determine where the Office of the Chancellor should be located so that it can carry out all of its responsibilities most effectively.**

52. **That the Legislature direct the Board of Governors to issue an annual public "report card" summarizing important aspects of the educational accomplishments and financial condition of each district according to previously determined measures.**

53. **That the Board of Governors be authorized to conduct a management audit of any district according to previously determined criteria; that on the basis of the findings of the management audit the Board be authorized to recommend appropriate changes in the district's management practices. If the district subsequently fails to comply with those recommendations, the Board be authorized to implement appropriate sanctions, including appointmenmt of a special trustee.**

54. **That the Board of Governors conduct a thorough review of all statutes affecting the administration and operation of the Community Colleges, and recommend to the Legislature the amendment or repeal of those provisions regarding the management of the districts and colleges that have become obsolete in light of the increased authority being granted to the Board of Governors and of the clear postsecondary role of the colleges.**

District Organization and Management

In addition to strong statewide leadership, Community Colleges must have strong leadership and effective management at the district and college levels -- leadership and management that is responsive to local needs and aspirations and to statewide leadership, goals, and priorities. Currently, this management responsibility is distributed among seventy semi-autonomous districts of which there are fifty one-college districts, eleven two-college districts, six three-college districts, one four-college district, one five-college district, and one nine-college district.

In the course of its study and public hearings, the Commission has been reminded frequently that an important characteristic of the Community Colleges is their capacity to respond to the evolving values and needs of the many communities that make up this State. During the past seventy-five years, the Community Colleges have achieved well-documented educational successes. District governing boards have met the challenge of extraordinary growth in the 1960s and responded rapidly to increasing demand for adult education, remedial programs, and community service and contract courses in the 1970s. At the same time, they have maintained a substantial degree of unity statewide and generally remained financially sound in the face of major changes in their funding.

However, the Commission has also heard a number of important criticisms of the governance structure, criticisms too fundamental to be ignored. These include the charge that there is no direct linkage between the State-level Board of Governors and its Chancellor and the district-level governing boards and their chief executive officers. District administrators are accountable to their local boards, which are accountable to district electors, but neither is accountable to the Chancellor and Board of Governors. As a consequence, the Board of Governors and Chancellor have no effective means of enforcing their policy decisions or ensuring responsiveness to requests for accurate and timely information from the colleges.

In addition, district officials are under no constraint to approach the Legislature through the Board of Governors. They may and often do seek legislative intervention in matters of finance, academic policy, personnel, and facilities without Board of Governors' approval. Knowing that the Board of Governors has no direct, practical means of enforcing its decisions, the Legislature

and the Governor have little confidence that the Board of Governors and the Chancellor can manage the Community College system effectively and, therefore frequently intervene directly.

Since the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, the governing boards, which previously played a major role in determining district revenues and district expenditures, now control only expenditures. Voter interest in the management of Community College districts is minimal, and voter turnout for district elections averages less than fifteen percent. As a consequence, incumbent board members seldom face serious opposition except when well-organized interest groups seek to gain representation.

Existing district boundaries exacerbate problems of the "free flow" of students and the employment of faculty on a full-time basis. Faculty must often cross district lines to obtain full-time employment, just as students must often cross district lines, if they are permitted to do so, to obtain the instruction they desire.

The Commission has examined a number of alternative organization proposals that were intended to:

1. Establish direct accountability between the Board of Governors and the district boards.
2. Maintain the colleges' responsiveness to local needs.
3. Strengthen the confidence of the Legislature and the Governor in the ability of the Board to exercise the leadership with which it is charged.
4. Reinforce the postsecondary character of the system by consolidating the multitude of districts inherited from the public school system.
5. Redraw district lines so that each district will encompass an area that is closely related to the principal demographic, political, and economic development of the major regions of the State.
6. Encourage more efficient use of resources, better curricular planning, and more effective personnel and financial administration.
7. Reduce administrative barriers to student access to desired programs and courses.

The matter of district organization is extremely complex, however, and the Commission has not yet had an opportunity to consider the matter in sufficient depth to make a recommendation at this time.

The Commission recommends:

55. That the Legislature make no change in Community College district organization while the Commission continues its examination of alternative local governance structures, including enhancement of the existing structure.

District Governing Boards

Under the existing system of governance, strong district governing boards are essential to effective management and administration of Community Colleges. As representatives of the communities served by the colleges, these boards are an important conduit for the expression of community needs and aspirations and are the principal agencies through which the college administrators can be held accountable to local voters.

Elections for Community College district boards, held in odd-numbered years, result in very low voter turnout. The turnout and vote for board candidates in November of even-numbered years, when other candidates and issues are on the ballot, would probably be significantly higher.

Once elected, new trustees seldom have the background or training necessary to enable them to fully understand and carry out their responsibilities. Although some effort is now made to provide such training, there is a need for a carefully prepared and thorough training program to be established by the Board of Governors and made available to new and continuing board members throughout the State.

The Commission recommends:

56. That the Legislature require all elections for members of Community College district governing boards be held in November of even-numbered years.

57. That the Board of Governors, in cooperation with the districts and other interested agencies, prepare and administer a systematic training program for district governing board members that covers district financial management, academic policy making, collective bargaining, statewide standards, and other matters essential to the effective operation of a district governing board.

Campus Administration

Faculty senates must play an important role in academic policy making and administration in the Community Colleges. Substantial faculty participation strengthens the instructional programs of the colleges, encourages greater cooperation in their development, and buttresses the postsecondary character of the institutions by enhancing a collegial campus culture.

Currently, faculty senates play a relatively small role in formulating and administering academic policies on Community College campuses. In other postsecondary institutions, academic senates are usually the formal policy recommending bodies for admission standards, degree requirements, curriculum development, academic planning, and the appointment, evaluation, and promotion of academic employees. Although in most instances their formal role is advisory, within the system of collegial governance common to the four-year campuses, their recommendations are nearly always followed.

Student government has also played a smaller part in the Community Colleges than in other postsecondary institutions. The Commission believes, however, that students can make an important contribution to academic planning, the evaluation of faculty, the evaluation of teaching materials and processes, and campus administration if given the opportunity to do so.

The Commission recommends:

58. That the Board of Governors strengthen the role of faculty senates with respect to the determination and administration of academic standards; course approval; hiring, retention, and evaluation of faculty; and other academic functions.

59. That the Board of Governors, working with district and student representatives, develop a plan for encouraging greater student participation in appropriate aspects of campus and district administration.

Six Community College Finance

Since the passage of Proposition 13, Community College finance has become a major concern of the Governor and the Legislature. With the passage of that property tax reform initiative, a system of State and local support that had grown out of public school funding was suddenly turned on its head: the districts lost control over property tax revenues, which were sharply reduced, and the State became the dominant source of support. Since then, several funding systems have been tried and discarded in an effort to adapt the old system of financing to the new circumstances.

Sources of Support

The Community College finance system must draw upon a strong tax base that provides sufficient resources to enable the colleges to offer high quality instructional programs for all eligible students. It must be predictable, and it must reflect the essential role the Community Colleges play in the State's tripartite system of public postsecondary education.

Following the 1978 passage of Proposition 13, State support for the Community Colleges climbed from forty-two percent to nearly seventy percent of district general fund revenues from all sources. Local property tax revenues were fixed at a fraction of the share previously available to the colleges. Since then, the imposition of a fifty dollar tuition charge and growth in property tax revenues have reduced the State General Fund share of total revenues to approximately sixty-two percent, while local revenues provide twenty-eight percent, student fees six percent, and the federal government four percent. Control of the major revenues, however, remains with the State.

Since district governing boards no longer determine the amount of property tax the districts will receive, it makes little difference whether the districts rely more or less heavily upon such revenues. There is no reason, therefore, to attempt to fix the State General Fund share at some arbitrary level or to eliminate property tax revenues as a source of Community College support. To do either would require a change in the allocation of property tax revenues among other local jurisdictions, and such a change could be more disruptive than helpful.

The Commission recommends:

60. That the Governor and the Legislature continue to allow State General Fund support to fluctuate with the relative increase or decrease in property tax revenues available for Community College support.

Budgeting State Support

The system of budgeting State support must reflect that the Community Colleges are postsecondary institutions operating under a statewide governing board directed by statute to "provide leadership and direction" in their continuing development "as an integral and effective element in the structure of public higher education in the state." The budget system must be free of cumbersome detail and flexible enough to accommodate changing needs and circumstances. It must also offer a reasonable degree of predictability and protect the State from large unexpected increases in expenditures. It must encourage local initiative and not exacerbate the impact of enrollment gains and losses.

The existing system of budgeting has none of these qualities. The budget formula for Community College State support, unlike those for the University of California and the California State University, is written into the *Education Code*. Changes of any kind must be introduced as amendments to existing law and pass through the full legislative process for approval. Recently, revisions of the statutory financing formula frequently have been subject to extensive debate

in the Legislature as proposed amendments have made their way through the process.

The current system uses as a workload measure - average daily attendance (ADA) -- that is a vestige of the colleges' origins as a part of the public school system. Nationwide, other postsecondary institutions use full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment units. Moreover, all support from State and local revenues is tied by formula directly to increases and decreases in ADA although many costs of operating the colleges do not fluctuate with that enrollment count. Student services, for example, are more closely related to headcount enrollment and have long been underfunded for this reason.

A more flexible and appropriate system of budgeting has been employed by the State for many years in providing support for the University of California and the California State University. If the support formula is removed from the *Education Code*, the Board of Governors and the Department of Finance will be permitted to develop an administrative system that is more predictable, more sensitive to important cost factors, and in other respects more suitable to the postsecondary character of the Community Colleges. This system can also be designed to ensure that support intended for a particular purpose, such as remedial instruction, is in fact spent for that purpose.

In conjunction with these changes, it will also be appropriate to examine the current statutory provisions according to which county superintendents of schools continue to provide certain financial services and perform budget reviews and expenditure audits for Community College districts. Some of these activities may better be performed by the Board of Governors in connection with its other fiscal responsibilities.

The Commission recommends:

61. That the Legislature repeal the current support budget formula for the Community Colleges and that the Board of Governors and the Department of Finance develop a set of nonstatutory budget instructions.

62. That the Board of Governors develop and implement, with the approval of the Governor and the Legislature, a simplified system of "differential funding" to be used in budgeting State support for the Community Colleges. This system should incorporate workload measures for student services, plant maintenance and operation, and campus administration other than FTE enrollment. Consideration should be given to segregating remedial instruction costs from other instructional costs to allow for the generally higher cost of remediation.

63. That the Governor and the Legislature substitute full-time equivalent enrollment (FTE) units for average daily attendance (ADA) units in budgeting support for the Community Colleges and that the Governor, the Legislature, and the Board of Governors agree upon a method of conversion that precludes a significant loss of support to any college because of the conversion.

64. That the Board of Governors develop and implement, with the approval of the Governor and the Legislature, a method of reducing the impact of enrollment gains or losses so that they do not unnecessarily jeopardize the instructional programs of the colleges.

65. That the Board of Governors, with the assistance of an advisory committee made up of representatives of Community College districts, county superintendents of schools, county treasurers, county auditors, and other interested county agencies, review current statutes regarding fiscal services provided Community College districts by county superintendents of schools to determine which functions might more appropriately be carried out by the Board of Governors or the districts and propose legislation to accomplish the transfer of these functions.

Distributing State Support

The Board of Governors must be given more control over the allocation of funds to districts to provide leadership for the Community College system at the State level. The Board must also be given the authority to promote equity, provide special assistance, and identify and reward ex-

cellence in instruction and other activities among the colleges.

The current system of finance gives the Board of Governors no real discretion in allocating the annual appropriation of State support among the districts. The Board of Governors, through the Chancellor's Office, must allocate the annual appropriation just as it was formulated. If its role in this regard is to be fully flexible and its statewide leadership strengthened, the Board will need authority to allocate State support among the seventy districts according to clearly established and equitable guidelines that would permit reallocation of resources among the districts.

The Commission recommends:

66. That the Legislature authorize the Board of Governors to allocate State support among the districts according to rules and regulations to be established by the Board.

Emergency Support

The Community Colleges must have the same access to support for unanticipated costs and emergencies as the University of California, the California State University, and other State agencies. The manner in which emergency support is provided, however, must reflect that district governing boards and administrators are not directly accountable to the Board of Governors for college management.

In the event of unanticipated enrollment increases or other financial emergencies, districts must, in effect, borrow from the State School Fund or seek a loan or special appropriation from the State's general fund. There is no established precedent or procedure for such aid other than special legislation. The University of California, the California State University, and other State agencies, on the other hand, frequently receive support from the State's contingency fund or the annual deficiency appropriation when they face unanticipated cost increases. Inasmuch as they are directly accountable to the Governor and the Legislature, this poses no special problems. If the Community Colleges are to be eligible for similar assistance, however, the Governor and the Legislature must be assured that the need is genuine and that the emergency will not continue indefinitely. Thus, emergency aid must be coupled with a means of assuring that the cause of the emergency will be effectively removed.

The Commission recommends:

67. That the Governor and the Legislature provide emergency assistance to a Community College, when requested by the Board of Governors and fully justified, through the existing system of deficiency appropriations. That whenever such assistance is required for reasons other than unanticipated enrollment gains or losses, funding be contingent upon agreement by the college to (a) cooperate with a special financial and management audit by a team appointed by the Board of Governors, and (b) abide by the recommendations of that team as approved by the Board of Governors.

Capital Outlay Funding

The system for budgeting capital outlay funds, like that for budgeting support for current expense, must reflect the postsecondary status of the Community Colleges and its organization under a State Board of Governors. Capital outlay funding must also be free of unnecessary detail, responsive to changing needs, and supportive of local initiative while protecting the State from large, unexpected increases in expenditures.

The Community Colleges, as a consequence of the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, have no substantial source of local funds for capital outlay. State revenues have funded eighty-five to ninety percent of approved projects in the last few years, and Community College capital outlay funding has become in effect a State responsibility. The role of the Board of Governors is greater for capital outlay than it is for current expense support, but the role would be further enhanced, in keeping with the Commission's recommendations, if the Board's authority to allocate capital outlay funds among the districts were increased.

The Commission recommends:

68. That the Governor and the Legislature provide full State funding for approved Community College capital outlay projects, and that all such projects be budgeted by the Board of Governors and reviewed and approved by the Governor and the Legislature, as are University of California and California State University capital outlay projects.

Seven A New Master Plan for Postsecondary Education in California

The foregoing report and recommendations have been submitted in response to the directive contained in SB 2064 (Stiern), Chapter 1506, Statutes of 1984. Having completed its reassessment of the California Community Colleges, the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education will now turn its attention to the broader directive contained in SB 1570 (Nielsen), Chapter 1507, Statutes of 1984.

SB 1570 instructed the Commission to examine and report on California's postsecondary education needs through the year 2000, lower division instruction in all segments, strategies to promote an increase in student access to and success in postsecondary education from adult education to graduate instruction, the appropriateness of existing educational delivery systems, and direct and indirect expenditures for postsecondary education, including student financial aid. These are the minimum requirements of the study; the Commission will surely find additional matters of interest as it undertakes a thorough review of the State's Master Plan for Higher Education and drafts a new plan to guide the development of postsecondary education through the end of this century.

The results of the study and the Commission's recommendations for the new plan are to be presented to the Legislature and the Governor no later than January 1, 1987. This means that a major task must be completed in a very short time, but with the continued cooperation of all interested institutions, organizations, and private citizens, the Commission is confident that it can meet its charge.

APPENDIX A Preliminary Cost Estimates

The following are the Commission's preliminary first-year cost estimates for the recommendations adopted by the Commission.

Mandatory assessment, counseling, placement, and follow-up program: $50,000,000

This program is similar to the "matriculation" plan developed and proposed for funding by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. According to the Chancellor's Office 1984 report on that plan, it was expected to cost from $22 million to $32 million in additional staff time and related expense plus a one-time cost of $5 million for data processing equipment. These figures have been updated recently by the Chancellor's Office, and the total (net) cost for the colleges is estimated at approximately $50 million, including $35 million for staff and related expense and $15 million for data processing.

Mandatory remedial enrollment: Indeterminable

The Commission recommends that enrollment in remedial courses be mandated based upon the assessment, counseling, and placement program. This may result in an increase in remedial class enrollment offset in part by a reduction in enrollment in other classes. The extent of the cost increase, if any, will depend on the amount of the enrollment shifted and the average cost differential for regular and remedial courses. Neither amount can be determined at this time.

Board of Governors and California Postsecondary Postsecondary Education Commission -- Special Studies and Institutional Research Projects: $200,000

The Commission recommends that the Board of Governors establish or participate in three types of major institutional research and evaluation projects. It also recommends that the California Postsecondary Education Commission conduct a major study of noncredit adult basic education. We estimate the combined first year costs of these studies to be approximately $200,000. Their full cost could be approximately $1,500,000 over a period of several years.

Board of Governors: Establishing academic requirements, program development, annual reports, and similar activities: $1,000,000

The Commission recommends that the Board of Governors undertake a number of activities that individually might have little cost but, taken together, are likely to require additional staff and related expense. We estimate the total cost of these activities to be approximately $1,000,000 annually.

Part-Time Faculty: $9,600,000

The Commission believes that part-time faculty should be required to participate in student advisement and curricular development in addition to classroom instruction and be compensated accordingly. We estimate that the additional compensation and related costs could amount to ten percent of total part-time faculty salaries. We estimate that figure to be approximately $96 million, of which ten percent is $9.6 million.

Professional Development: $9,000,000

The Commission recommends that the Board of Governors develop and implement a plan to strengthen professional development programs for faculty and administrators in the Community Colleges. We estimate the first year development cost at $200,000 and the eventual implementation cost at a maximum of $9 million, or about one percent of salaries for faculty and administrators in the current year.

Training Program for District Board Members: $150,000.

The Commission recommends that the Board of Governors develop and implement a training program for newly elected district board members. We estimate the development and implementation costs of such a program at $150,000 annually, depending on the number of new board members elected.

APPENDIX B The Commission and the Process

Establishment of the Commission

Postsecondary education in California is organized under the provisions of a statewide Master Plan, adopted in 1960. The plan delineates roles, responsibilities, governance, and coordination of the three public postsecondary systems: the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California. Independent colleges and universities are also considered in the Master Plan, although it does not deal directly with their functions, financing, or governance.

Recent concerns about the changing educational needs of California's adult population and the extent to which the three systems are meeting those needs, gave rise to legislation establishing the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (SB 1570 Nielsen; Chapter 1507, Statutes of 1984).

The Commission members are:

Governor's Appointees
- J. Gary Shansby, San Francisco (Chairman)
- William D. Campbell, Carlsbad (Vice Chairman)
- Meredith J. Khachigian, San Clemente
- Edward R. Mosley, Fresno

Senate Rules' Appointees
- Patsy Estrellas, Anaheim
- Felix S. LeMarinel, Anaheim
- Cornell Maier (resigned; position currently vacant).

Speaker's Appointees
- Henry Der, San Francisco
- Peter McCuen, Rancho Cordova
- Michael R. Peevey, Rosemead

University of California Regents' Appointee
- Harold Williams, Los Angeles

California State University Trustees' Appointee
- Claudia Hampton, Los Angeles

Community College Board of Governors' Appointee
- George David Kieffer, Los Angeles

California Postsecondary Education Commission's Appointee
- Seth P. Brunner, Sacramento

Superintendent of Public Instruction's Appointee
- Bill Honig, Sacramento
- Xavier Del Buono, Sacramento (Superintendent's designee)

Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities' Appointee
- Ray Remy, Los Angeles

The Commission staff are:

Lee R. Kerschner, Executive Director
A. Alan Post, Consultant (served as Interim Executive Director)
Janis Cox Coffey, Executive Staff
Jerome Evans, Executive Staff
Robert S. Palacio, Executive Staff
Julia B. Fahrenbruch, Administrative Officer
Kim Crocker, Office Assistant

The Commission is required to submit a report to the Legislature and the Governor, relative to its findings and recommendations on the Master Plan, by January 1, 1987.

Commission Subcommittees and Management Plan

The first meeting of the Commission was held on March 26, 1985. At that time the following Subcommittees were established:

Roles, Responsibilities, Goals and Missions of the Segments
- William D. Campbell, Chair
- Seth P. Brunner
- Peter McCuen

Ray Remy
(Cornell Maier served on this subcommittee, prior to his resignation)

Access to and Success in Higher Education
Claudia Hampton, Chair
Xavier Del Buono
Henry Der
Meredith Khachigian
Michael Peevey

Future Needs to the Year 2000
George David Kieffer, Chair
Patsy Estrellas
Felix S. LeMarinel
Edward R. Mosley
Harold Williams

In response to ACR 162 (Hughes), the Commission established a Task Force charged with the responsibility to develop a management plan. That plan was approved by the Commission on May 21, 1985 and submitted to the Joint Legislative Committee shortly thereafter. It was approved by the Legislative Committee, with suggested changes, on August 27, 1985.

The Community College Reassessment Study

Simultaneously with the establishment of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, the Legislature adopted and the Governor signed SB 2064 Stiern (Chapter 1506, 1984), which mandated a special Community College Reassessment Study as the Commission's first priority and requested a special report to the Legislature and Governor by December 31, 1985. That date was subsequently extended and the final report adopted by the Commission on March 18, 1986.

The Process

The Commission and its subcommittees adhered to a very rigorous schedule, conducting a series of open meetings (twenty-two) and public hearings (six) that included presentations from members of the Legislature and their staffs; presidents, chancellors, administrative staff, and faculty representatives from the California Community Colleges, the California State University and the University of California; students; independent sector representatives; representatives of the Department of Education and the California Postsecondary Education Commission; professional researchers and others. In addition, the Commission distributes over 550 copies of its monthly meeting agendas and materials to representatives of the postsecondary education community, students, libraries, and the general public.

While considering various policy options at each regular meeting, the Chair sought comments and advice from individuals in the audience (an average of forty people attended). In addition, the Chair encouraged individuals and organizations to submit comments in writing and instructed staff to distribute those materials to all Commissioners. The Commissioners were well represented at all regular meetings, with no less than twelve of the sixteen in attendance at any one time. The six public hearings held in October 1985 and January 1986 were equally well attended with an average of six Commissioners, thirty speakers, and one hundred people in the audience.

The Commission Chair, Vice Chair, and individual Commissioners have attended and participated in various conferences conducted by students, faculty, administrators, and other postsecondary groups and organizations.

The Executive Director has had the advice and counsel of a segmental staff advisory committee, as well as a special committee on remediation chaired by Janis Coffey. In addition, the Executive Director met regularly with a group of Community College presidents and chancellors and participated in various student, faculty, governing board, and organizational conferences and meetings held at both the local and statewide level.

The Commission reviewed and synthesized a substantial amount of research information, statistics, and background material prior to development of the study. The public policy issues the Commission wished to see addressed in the Community College Reassessment Study were adopted by the Commission in September 1985.

The first draft outline, containing a series of policy options, was reviewed and revised by the Com-

mission and its Subcommittees in October 1985. The Commission conducted three public hearings for the purpose of receiving testimony on the policy options being considered from citizens and representatives of the postsecondary education community: October 10 in Los Angeles; October 17 in San Jose; and October 29 in Sacramento.

In November 1985, the second draft outline was submitted for further Commission consideration and revision as a Committee of the Whole.

In December 1985, the third draft outline was considered by the Commission and final policy options for conversion into recommendations, as well as alternative recommendations, were selected. The Commission instructed staff to revise and edit the third draft outline for submission as "background papers" for the final report. The Commission further instructed staff to bring back a concise draft of the final report at its January 1986 meeting, that would include recommendations based upon selected options and provide a mechanism for resolution of outstanding issues.

The first draft of the report, containing a series of principles, findings, and recommendations, was submitted for Commission consideration in January 1986. The period for formal segmental comments on the draft report (previously established) was January 13 through January 31, 1986.

The Commission conducted three more public hearings in January 1986 for the purpose of receiving testimony from citizens and representatives of the postsecondary education community: January 14 in Fresno; January 16 in San Diego; and January 21 in San Mateo.

The second draft of the report was submitted to the Commission in February 1986 for further consideration of formal segmental comments and previous public testimony. The Commission gave final instructions for additional revisions to be submitted for consideration at its March 1986 meeting.

The final draft of the Community College Reassessment Study was revised and adopted by the Commission in March 1986 for subsequent submission to the Joint Legislative Committee for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education.

APPENDIX C SB 2064 (Stiern), Chapter 1506

Senate Bill No. 2064

CHAPTER 1506

An act relating to community colleges, making an appropriation therefor, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

[Approved by Governor September 27, 1984. Filed with Secretary of State September 28, 1984.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 2064, Stiern. Community colleges: reassessment study.

Existing law does not provide for a community college reassessment study.

This bill would provide that a Community College Reassessment Study be undertaken, and that the study be directed by the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan established pursuant to SB 1570 of the 1983–84 Regular Session. Pursuant to the study, a report would be prepared, as specified, and submitted to the Joint Committee for the Review of the Master Plan established pursuant to ACR 162 of the 1983–84 Regular Session for its review on or before December 31, 1985. Following the legislative review, the bill would require the commission to make other specified assessments and policy recommendations.

This bill would require the commission to complete the study by December 31, 1986. This bill would not take effect unless ACR 162 and SB 1570 are both chaptered.

This bill would take effect immediately as an urgency statute.

Appropriation: yes.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. (a) The Legislature finds and declares that the community colleges are a large and important segment of California's system of public higher education. In the last 20 years, community colleges have not only experienced tremendous growth in the numbers of students enrolled, but have undergone a major transition in the types of students served and the types of programs and courses offered. Community colleges have also experienced an unacceptable degree of uncertainty and instability in their revenues over the last decade.

(b) The Legislature further finds and declares that legislative actions regarding community colleges have not been based on a comprehensive policy on the role that community colleges should play in public education. Community colleges have been reacting and responding to narrow changes in state policy that have shaped the functions of the colleges by default, rather than by design.

(c) It is, therefore, the intent of the Legislature to require the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education established pursuant to Senate Bill 1570 of the 1983–84 Regular Session to set the reassessment of the mission of the community colleges as its first and highest priority.

SEC. 2. The study described in this act shall be conducted as follows:

(a) The study shall be an assessment of the mission of the community colleges. The assessment shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following:

(1) A comparison of the statutory directives regarding the programs and activities required to be offered by community colleges, and the programs and activities actually offered by community colleges.

(2) An assessment of, and recommendations regarding, the appropriateness of all of the following programs, courses, and activities to the mission of the community colleges, particularly with respect to the functions of other state educational institutions, and the priorities which should be given to all of the following programs, courses, and activities:

(A) Transfer programs.

(B) Vocational programs.

(C) Programs leading to associate degrees.

(D) Certificate programs leading to employment.

(E) General education courses.

(F) Remedial and basic skills courses.

(G) Noncredit courses.

(H) Fee-supported community services courses.

(I) Student services, including, but not limited to, counseling, testing, job placement, and financial aid.

(J) Other programs, courses, and activities currently offered by community colleges.

(3) An assessment of the current socioeconomic composition of community college students, and recommendations for methods to ensure that all California residents will have access to community college programs and services.

(4) Policy recommendations designed to ensure that the academic quality of community college programs and courses will be maintained and enhanced.

(5) Other policy recommendations regarding the mission of the community colleges or community college operations the commission deems appropriate.

(b) On or before December 31, 1985, the commission shall submit the findings and recommendations developed pursuant to subdivision (a) to the Joint Committee for the Review of the Master Plan for Postsecondary Education.

SEC. 3. The reassessment study, as specified in Section 2 of this act, shall be directed by the Commission for the Review of the Master

Plan for Higher Education.

SEC. 4. Upon completion of the reassessment study authorized by this act, all of the documents and working papers of the commission shall become the property of, and be maintained by, the State Archives.

SEC. 5. This bill shall not take effect unless Assembly Concurrent Resolution 162 and Senate Bill 1570, both of the 1983–84 Regular Session, are also chaptered.

SEC. 6. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts constituting the necessity are:

In order that the reassessment study required by this act may be completed as expeditiously as possible so that the important problems facing community colleges may be addressed, it is necessary that this act take effect immediately.

o

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE
FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
JUN 13 1986